UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,032	02/26/2004	Hiroshi Iida	118828	2931

25944 7590 08/08/2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
MEHRMANESH, ELMIRA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2113	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/786,032	IIDA, HIROSHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elmira Mehrmanesh	2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 May 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Final Rejection

This action is in response to an amendment filed on May 10, 2007 for the application of Iida, for a "Service processing system, processing result management device and processing result checking method of service processing system" filed February 26, 2004.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 USC § 102.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Omori et al. (U.S. PGPUB No. 20020184405).

As per claim 1, Omori discloses a service processing system processing a service for performing predetermined linkage processing on document data over a network (Fig. 1 and 4) comprising:

a plurality of service processing devices (Fig. 1)

including: a processor that performs specific processing of the service (Fig. 1, element 5a)

a memory that stores processing result logs of the processor (Fig. 1, element 16)

a processing result management device (Fig. 7, element 35)

including: a receiver that receives the processing result logs stored in the memory (page 9, paragraph [0206])

a generator that generates service result information indicating whether linkage processing of the service has terminated normally on the basis of the processing result logs of the plurality of service processing devices (page 9, paragraph [0206] and page 6, paragraph [0133]).

As per claim 2, Omori discloses the processing result management device further includes an output part that outputs the service result information (page 6, paragraph [0143]).

As per claim 3, Omori discloses the processing result management device is, included in at least one of the plurality of service processing devices (Fig. 7, element 35).

As per claim 4, Omori discloses the receiver receives the processing result logs through the service processing devices (Fig. 2).

As per claim 5, Omori discloses a processing result checking method of a service processing system that processes a service for performing predetermined linkage processing on document data among a plurality of service processing devices connected to a network (Fig. 1 and 4) comprising:

receiving processing result logs in the service processing devices performing specific processing of the service (page 9, paragraph [0206])

generating service result information indicating whether the service has terminated normally on the basis of the received processing result logs (page 9, paragraph [0206] and page 6, paragraph [0133]).

As per claim 6, Omori discloses outputting the service result information (page 6, paragraph [0143]).

As per claim 7, Omori discloses the service result information is generated by at least one of the plurality of service processors performing the specific processing (Fig. 7, element 35).

As per claim 8, Omori discloses the processing result logs are received from the plurality of service processing devices performing the specific processing (Fig. 2).

As per claim 9, Omori discloses a processing result management device in a service processing system processing a service for performing

predetermined linkage processing on document data over a network (Fig. 1 and 4) the processing result management device comprising:

a receiver that receives processing result logs of the plurality of service processing devices performing specific processing of the service (page 9, paragraph [0206])

a generator that generates service result information indicating whether linkage processing of the service has terminated normally on the basis of the processing result logs of the plurality of service processing devices (page 9, paragraph [0206] and page 6, paragraph [0133]).

As per claim 10, Omori discloses including an output part that outputs the service result information (page 6, paragraph [0143]).

As per claim 11, Omori discloses a service processing system processing a service for performing predetermined linkage processing on document data over a network (Fig. 1 and 4) comprising:

a plurality of service processing devices (Fig. 1)

including: a processing means for performing specific processing of the service (Fig. 1, element 5a)

a storage means for storing processing result logs of the processor (Fig. 1, element 16)

a processing result management device (Fig. 7, element 35)

including: a receiving means for receiving the processing result logs stored in the memory (page 9, paragraph [0206])

a generating means for generating service result information indicating whether linkage processing of the service has terminated normally on the basis of the processing result logs of the plurality of service processing devices (page 9, paragraph [0206] and page 6, paragraph [0133]).

As per claim 12, Omori discloses the processing result management device further includes an output means for outputting the service result information (page 6, paragraph [0143]).

As per claim 13, Omori discloses the processing result management device is included in at least one of the plurality of service processing devices (Fig. 7, element 35).

As per claim 14, Omori discloses the receiving means receives the processing result logs through the service processing devices (Fig. 2).

As per claim 15, Omori discloses a processing result management device in a service processing system processing a service for performing predetermined linkage processing on document data over a network (Fig. 1 and 4) the processing result management device comprising:

a receiving means for receiving processing result logs of a plurality of service processing devices performing specific processing of the service (page 9, paragraph [0206])

a generating means for generating service result information indicating whether linkage processing of the service has terminated normally on the basis of the processing result logs of the plurality of service processing devices (page 9, paragraph [0206] and page 6, paragraph [0133]).

As per claim 16, Omori discloses an output means for outputting the service result information (page 6, paragraph [0143]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 10, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claims 1, 5, 9, 11 and 15, in response to applicant's arguments that Omeri fails to teach a memory that stores processing result logs and a receiver that receives the processing result log stored in the memory, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and would like to point out to page 2, paragraph [0047] and page 4, paragraph [0091], wherein Omeri discloses a record unit that records data that represents an operation state of an information processing service provided through a network. Furthermore noting (page 2, paragraph [0048] and page 4, paragraph [0093], wherein Omeri discloses upon receiving

the operation state data...), which teaches of a receiver that receives the recorded information.

In response to applicant's argument (*see page 2 of Applicant's Remarks*) that the reference fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *the information illustrated in Fig. 13 of the Applicant's disclosure*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1 .136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1 .136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elmira Mehrmanesh whose telephone number is (571) 272-5531. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).